



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/459,260 | 12/10/1999 | EDWARD MARGOSCIN | 5053-30700 | 9934 |

7590 01/31/2003

ERIC B MEYERTONS
CONLEY ROSE & TAYON PC
PO BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 787670398

EXAMINER

PATEL, JAGDISH

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3624

DATE MAILED: 01/31/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/459,260

Applicant(s)

MARGOSCIN ET AL.

Examiner

JAGDISH N PATEL

Art Unit

3624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 November 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 36-70 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 36-70 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to amendment filed 11/15/02.

Response to Amendment

2. The specification has been amended, claims 1-35 have been canceled and new claims 36-70 have been added per request.
- 3.
4. Objection to specification have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-35 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 36-70 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonough et al. (US Pat. 6,115,693) and further in view of Thorne (US Pat. 6,100,891).

Application/Control Number:
09/459,260
Art Unit: 3624

Page 3

8. Examiner's note: the following definition of CORBA architecture is extracted from web site <http://www.trinity.edu/~rjensen/245glosf.htm#CORBA> and provided for convenience of the applicant, since many features recited in the claims are facilitated by CORBA which is the platform used in the McDonough reference.

CORBA= Common Object Request Broker Architecture is in competition with Microsoft's OLE/DCOM object-oriented Middleware technology for business applications. CORBA is most popular in communications Middleware using an Object Request Broker ORB. CORBA evolved out of TCP/IP. DCOM is bundled with the Windows 2000 operating system but has lackluster support for other operating systems. CORBA is more flexible with other operating systems. Both CORBA and OLE/DCOM are designed to distribute objects or assembly of applications from discreet, self-contained components. Both are appealing in the fast growing technology of "object middleware." Object middleware has corporate appeal due to the ability to provide highly abstracted object-oriented programming interfaces. Microsoft added new terminology in this area. For example, COM depicts a Component Object Model to describe the base model used for building components. The term DCOM is the Distributed form of COM. ActiveX (formerly OCX) is the packaging technology for controls and supercedes prior Visual Basic Controls known as VBX. OLE no longer means object linking and embedding. OLE now refers to a collection of technologies. For interactive computing on the web, see Distributed Network Computing. A good textbook chapter on CORBA is given at <http://ei.cs.vt.edu/~wwwbtb/fall.96/book/chap20/index.html>. Also

Application/Control Number:
09/459,260
Art Unit: 3624

Page 4

see RPC and

<http://www.trinity.edu/rjensen/260wp/260wp.htm#ODBC>.

Claim 36: McDonough teaches a system comprising:

a server configured to process business transactions
(servers operated by Content providers, Fig. 4 and L 426, ...434,
col. 8 L 61-67);

a middleware program communicatively coupled to the server
(context manager 402, Fig. 4 and col. 8 L 51- 60, which
provides management of the information);

a channel communicatively coupled to the middleware program
and to the server (channel is shown as customer contact access
methods and shown in Fig. 4 as kiosk 424, call center 422, phone
420 etc.); and

an interface program communicatively coupled to the channel
and to the middleware program, wherein the interface program is
configured to receive data and a command that will initiate a
business transaction (the context manager also performs
functions of the interface program as described in col. 8 L 51-
67, management capability for multiple customer access resources
which share common business processes);

wherein the interface program receives data from the
channel and transmits the data to the middleware program (an
inherent feature of a middleware CORBA as discussed in col. 9 L
25-30, also refer to description of the context manager
discussed in analysis of above steps).

McDonough, while teaches the system substantially as
claimed, fails to explicitly, recite a domain file comprising a
list of allowable values associated with one or more business
transactions and that the middleware program determines whether

portions of the received data include allowable values based on the domain file validates portions of the data, transforms the data into a form required by the server, and transmits the transformed data to the server. It is noted such functionality, is inherent and essential to successfully deploy the communication applications of McDonough in the CORBA architecture ((an inherent feature of a middleware CORBA as discussed in col. 9 L 25-30, also refer to description of the context manager discussed in analysis of above steps).

Thorne, in the same field of endeavor, however, teaches a system for application of data communication and data conversion and validation which comprises a domain file comprising a list of allowable values associated with a business transaction (col. 6 L 17-30)and further suggests determining whether the portion of the data include allowable values based on a domain files (list of allowable values .. or establishing a database).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the domain file comprising a list of allowable values and determining allowability of the data based on the domain file (validation of input data) as suggested by Thorne to McDonough because validation of input data would provide conformity to the format requirements and limits imposed by the server to facilitate further processing of the data by the server.

Claims 37. wherein the middleware program receives a result from the business transaction server and transfers the result to the interface program (Fig. 4 context manager, 402).

Claim 38-41. wherein the channel comprises a kiosk (a computer terminal, a call center, a an electronic data transfer

system (refer to customer access methods shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 4 heterogeneous systems 406).

Claim 42-43 . wherein a local area network (wide area network) communicatively couples the channel to the server (Fig. 4 LAN/WAN).

Claim 44. wherein the portions of the domain file may be changed without changing code of the middleware program (col. 9 L 25-30, a feature of the CORBA used for distributed computing and object messaging).

Claims 45 wherein the middleware program generates an error code if the portions of the received data include values that are not allowable values (inherent feature of context manager because as described in col. 9 L 52-62 as the Quality Center which performs reporting 508, messaging and trouble shooting 512).

Claim 46 wherein the domain file comprises at least one serialized file generated by the domain manager (inherent feature of the CORBA used for distributed computing and object messaging)

Claim 47. wherein the middleware program transfers data to a plurality of business transaction servers during the processing of a business transaction (refer to Fig. 4, context Manager 402, transfers data to a plurality of transaction servers 404).

Claim 48. wherein the middleware program comprises computer code written in an object-oriented programming language (col. 9 L 25-30, CORBA, features of openness and functionality).

Claim 49. wherein the middleware program is extendable without altering source code of the middleware program ((col. 9 L 25-30, CORBA, inherent to the architecture) .

Claims 50. wherein an extension to the middleware program comprises computer code that is stored in a package and run when the middleware program runs((col. 9 L 25-30, CORBA, inherent to the architecture) .

Claims 51-60. All limitations of claims 51-60 have been analyzed as in claims 36-50. Note that flattening data is inherent part of formatting and data communication among different devices.

Claims 61-70. All limitations of claims 61-70 have been analyzed as in claims 36-50.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number:
09/459,260
Art Unit: 3624

Page 8

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jagdish Patel whose telephone number is (703) 308-7837. The examiner can normally be reached Monday-Thursday from 8:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Vincent Millin, can be reached at (703) 308-1038. The fax number for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 3600 is (703) 305-7687. Draft faxes may be submitted directly to the examiner at (703) 746-5563.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113 or 308-1114. Address

Application/Control Number:

Page 9

09/459,260


Art Unit: 3624

for hand delivery is 2451 Crystal Drive, Crystal Park 5, 7th
Floor, Alexandria VA 22202.

Jagdish N. Patel

(Examiner, AU 3624)

1/27/03.



VINCENT MILLIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600